

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 207

May 25, 1995, 10:17 a.m.
Page S-7411 Temp. Record

BUDGET RESOLUTION/Off-Budget Medicare Enforcement Mechanism

SUBJECT: Senate Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal years 1996-2002 . . . S. Con. Res. 13. Domenici motion to table the Exon (for Harkin) amendment No. 1172.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 63-36

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. Con. Res. 13, the fiscal year 1996 Concurrent Budget Resolution, will reduce projected spending over 7 years to balance the budget by fiscal year (FY) 2002 without increasing taxes. Savings that will accrue from lower debt service payments (an estimated \$170 billion) will be dedicated to a reserve fund, which may be used for tax reductions after enactment of laws to ensure a balanced budget. Highlights include the following: the rate of growth in Medicare will be slowed to 7.1 percent; Medicaid's rate of growth will be slowed to 5 percent and it will be transformed into a block grant program; the Commerce Department and more than 100 other Federal programs, agencies, and commissions will be eliminated; welfare and housing programs will be reformed; agriculture, energy, and transportation subsidies will be cut; foreign aid will be cut; defense spending will be cut and then allowed to increase back to its 1995 level; and Social Security will not be altered.

The Exon (for Harkin) amendment would allow spending in excess of the spending caps on Medicare enforcement efforts to limit waste, fraud, and abuse in the program, if those efforts yield a return on investment to the Government of at least 4 dollars for each dollar invested; the caps could not be exceeded by more than \$50 million in FY 1996, rising to \$100 million in FY 2002.

The amendment was offered after all debate time had expired. However, some statements on amendments were added to the record or were made before the amendments were offered and before debate time had expired. Also, by unanimous consent, 1 minute of time was allowed on each amendment for explanatory statements before each vote. Senator Domenici moved to table the Harkin amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

(See other side)

YEAS (63)			NAYS (36)		NOT VOTING (1)	
Republicans (54 or 100%)	Democrats (9 or 20%)		Republicans (0 or 0%)	Democrats (36 or 80%)	Republicans (0)	Democrats (1)
Abraham	Hutchison	Baucus		Akaka		Mikulski- ²
Ashcroft	Inhofe	Bingaman		Biden		
Bennett	Jeffords	Bumpers		Boxer		
Bond	Kassebaum	Feingold		Bradley		
Brown	Kempthorne	Hollings		Breaux		
Burns	Kyl	Kohl		Bryan		
Campbell	Lott	Moynihan		Byrd		
Chafee	Lugar	Nunn		Conrad		
Coats	Mack	Robb		Daschle		
Cochran	McCain			Dodd		
Cohen	McConnell			Dorgan		
Coverdell	Murkowski			Exon		
Craig	Nickles			Feinstein		
D'Amato	Packwood			Ford		
DeWine	Pressler			Glenn		
Dole	Roth			Graham		
Domenici	Santorum			Harkin		
Faircloth	Shelby			Heflin		
Frist	Simpson					
Gorton	Smith					
Gramm	Snowe					
Grams	Specter					
Grassley	Stevens					
Gregg	Thomas					
Hatch	Thompson					
Hatfield	Thurmond					
Helms	Warner					

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

The Harkin amendment would have us place new Medicare enforcement efforts off budget if they generate enough revenue for the United States. We favor new enforcement efforts, but we favor cutting other spending to pay for them. We see no logical reason for diminishing the value of new efforts by not paying for them. By our colleagues' logic, the entire Internal Revenue Service's (IRS's) budget should not be under the spending caps, because that agency spends an awful lot less than it takes it. Of course, if we were to use this type of strange accounting, the result would be higher spending. Congress spends whatever it takes in, right up to the caps. The United States does not need to spend more money to save money; it only needs to spend the money it takes in more wisely. We therefore urge our colleagues to table the Harkin amendment.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

The General Accounting Office and the Health and Human Services inspectors general have found that Medicare losses are in the billions of dollars every year. According to the General Accounting Office, every \$1 that is currently invested to stem these losses results in \$11 in savings. Thus, increasing these efforts by \$1 over the current spending caps would result in a savings of \$10. The Harkin amendment would allow the spending caps to be breached for efforts that yield at least \$4 in return for each dollar invested. We should not allow an arbitrary spending cap stand in the way of saving money. Therefore, we oppose the motion to table.